



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,478	07/19/2000	Shunpei Yamazaki	0756-2187	1882

22204 7590 01/22/2004

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
401 9TH STREET, NW
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

ANYASO, UCHENDU O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2675	

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/619,478

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Uchendu O Anyaso

Art Unit

2675

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____


CHANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 14, Applicant contends that Sawada fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a digital video signal dividing circuit and a controller feeding pulses to the display panel. Furthermore, Applicant argues that Kuwabara merely teaches a digital video signal dividing circuit without any suggestion or motivation to include a controller feeding pulses to a display panel. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertions for at least the following reasons: First, Sawada teaches a control circuit in the form of a display mode dependence controller (17) that is connected to the digital image processor 3 and the scanning control circuit 22 (figure 1 at 3, 17). While, Sawada does not show the controller 17 feeding directly to display unit 4, the connection in Sawada of the controller 17 to the scanning control circuit 22 reads directly on applicant's circuit connectivity as shown in figure 1 (Compare figure 1 of Applicant and Sawada). The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a display device which can display an image in correspondence with various display modes (column 2, lines 40-45), and to achieve a scanning control circuit 22 that changes the scanning method in accordance with an instruction from the display mode dependence controller 17 in correspondence with the display mode (column 4, lines 40-43). Second, while Sawada does not teach explicitly a digital video signal dividing circuit, Kuwabara teaches this concept by teaching a driving method for an active matrix type image display having a plurality of video signal lines wherein a scheme is designed to achieve a digital video dividing circuit of an original video signal (column 12, lines 10-27, figure 7). The motivation for combining Sawada and Kuwabara would have been to prevent degradation in the display quality (column 12, lines 61-67 through column 13, line 4, figure 7). As such, this application in its current form is not in a condition for allowance.